



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/767,538 | 01/23/2001 | Yingjian Wang | 17281/00002 | 2993 |

7590

03/05/2003

Jenifer E. Haeckl
Mirick O'Connell, DeMallie & Lougee, LLP
100 Front Street
Worcester, MA 01608-1477

EXAMINER

BAKER, MAURIE GARCIA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1639

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/767,538

Applicant(s)
Wang et al

Examiner
Maurie G. Baker, Ph.D.

Art Unit
1639



— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ONE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-50 are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Please Note: In an effort to enhance communication with our customers and reduce processing time, Group 1639 is running a Fax Response Pilot for Written Restriction Requirements. A dedicated Fax machine is in place to receive your responses. The Fax number is 703-308-4315. A Fax cover sheet is attached to this Office Action for your convenience. We encourage your participation in this Pilot program. Thank you in advance for allowing us to enhance our customer service. Please limit the use of this dedicated Fax number to responses to Written Restrictions.

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-21, drawn to an array, classified variously, for example, class 435, DIG 23 – 28 or 34 – 39 OR class 536, subclass 24.3.
 - II. Claims 22-36, drawn to a method for making one or more arrays, classified variously, for example, class 427, subclass 466 OR class 435, subclass 305.1.
 - III. Claims 37-49, drawn to a method for bringing two or more reagents in contact with one or more biological targets, classified variously, for example, class 435, any of subclasses 5 – 40.52.
 - IV. Claim 50, drawn to a *second* method for bringing two or more reagents in contact with one or more biological targets, classified variously, for example, class 435, any of subclasses 5 – 40.52.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
3. Groups II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP

§ 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process. For example, the array of Group I could be made by photolithographic methods.

4. Groups I and III & IV are related as product and process(es) of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product, for example, the array of Group I could be used for the synthesis of other arrays (i.e. as a starting material for further synthesis of derivatized arrays). Moreover, applicant's disclosure of *two different methods* of using the array of Group I demonstrates that the array could be used in different processes.

5. Groups II – IV are different methods. The methods are different because they use different steps, require different reagents and/or will produce different results. They therefore have different issues regarding patentability and enablement and represent patentably distinct subject matter. In the instant case, the method for making arrays (Group II) is different from the methods of use of arrays (Groups III & IV), requiring different steps and having completely different end results (i.e. creating arrays vs. using an array for bringing two or more reagents in contact with one or more biological

targets). The methods of Group II & IV are different from each other because each method of use requires different steps and has a different end result. Most importantly, each of Groups III and IV requires a different “transfer”. The method of Group III transfers the reagent portion while the method of Group IV transfers the target.

6. Therefore, the groups that describe these inventions each have different issues regarding patentability and enablement, and represent patentably distinct subject matter, which merits separate and burdensome searches. Art anticipating or rendering obvious each of the above-identified groups respectively would not necessarily anticipate or render obvious another group, because they are drawn to different inventions that have different distinguishing features and/or characteristics. Each group could support a separate patent.

7. These inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or divergent subject matter. The different inventions would require different searches in the patent and non-patent databases, and there is no expectation that the searches would be coextensive. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention for **all of Groups I – IV.** Election is required as follows.

9. If applicant elects the invention of **Group I**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. One election from each of the below species is required. There are two species. Claim 1 is generic.

A. Species of reagent and carrier

A *single, specific* type of reagent should be elected, for purposes of search, from those set forth in claim 3. The property of the reagent should also be delineated, see distinct species set forth in claims 14-16. Also, applicant should set forth whether carriers are further used for immobilization and, if so, a specific type of carrier should be elected from those set forth in claim 13.

B. Species of barriers

| | |
|----------------------|--------------|
| B-1. Capillary tubes | Claims 4-12 |
| B-2. Supports | Claims 17-21 |

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made and/or in their specific steps and elements needed for carrying them out. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

10. If applicant elects the invention of **Group II**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. One election from each of the below species is required. There are two species. Claim 22 is generic.

A. Species of reagent and carrier

A *single, specific* type of reagent should be elected, for purposes of search, from those set forth in claim 36. Also, applicant should set forth whether carriers are further used for immobilization and, if so, a specific type of carrier should be elected from those set forth in claim 30.

B. Species of barriers

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| B-1. Capillary tubes | Claims 23-29 |
| B-2. Supports (used after tubes) | Claims 31-35 |

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting

materials from which they are made and/or in their specific steps and elements needed for carrying them out. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

11. If applicant elects the invention of **Group III**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. One election from each of the below species is required. There are three species. Claim 37 is generic.

A. Species of reagent

A single, specific type of reagent should be elected, for purposes of search, from those set forth in claim 39.

B. Species of barriers

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| B-1. Capillary tubes | Claims 40-42 |
| B-2. Supports (used after tubes) | Claims 43-45 |

C. Species of contacting

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| C-1. Seeding and adhering | Claims 46-47 |
| C-2. Applying conditions | Claims 48-49 |

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made and/or in their specific steps and elements needed for carrying them out. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

12. If applicant elects the invention of **Group IV**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. One election from each of the below species is required. There are two species. Claim 50 is generic.

A. Species of reagent

A single, specific type of reagent should be elected, for purposes of search.

B. Species of barriers

A single, specific type of barrier should be elected, for purposes of search.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made and/or in their specific steps and elements needed for carrying them out. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

13. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

14. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and ***a listing of all claims readable thereon***, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

15. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

16. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

17. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to applicants to request an oral election was not made. See MPEP § 812.01.


18. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

19. Applicant is also reminded that a 1 - month (not less than 30 days) shortened statutory period will be set for response when a written requirement is made without an action on the merits. This period may be extended under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Such action will not be an "action on the merits" for purposes of the second action final program, see MPEP 809.02(a).

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0065. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00 to 6:30 and alternate Fridays.

21. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Wang, can be reached at (703) 306- 3217. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D.
February 21, 2003



MAURIE GARCIA BAKER, Ph.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER



RESTRICTION ELECTION FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE:

FROM/ATTORNEY:

FIRM:

PAGES, INCLUDING COVERSHEET:

PHONE NUMBER:

TO EXAMINER: Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D.

ART UNIT: 1639

SERIAL NUMBER:

FAX/TELECOPIER NUMBER: (703) 308-4315

**PLEASE NOTE: THIS FACSIMILE NUMBER IS TO BE USED ONLY
FOR RESPONSES TO RESTRICTIONS.**

COMMENTS: _____

IF YOU HAVE NOT RECEIVED ALL THE PAGES OF THIS TRANSMISSION, PLEASE CONTACT THE ATTORNEY AT THE TELEPHONE NUMBER LISTED ABOVE.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH 1096 OG 30, THE FILING DATE ACCORDED EACH OFFICIAL FAX TRANSMISSION WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE FAX MACHINE DATE STAMP FOUND ON THE LAST PAGE OF THE TRANSMISSION, UNLESS THAT DATE IS A SATURDAY, SUNDAY, OR FEDERAL HOLIDAY WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, IN WHICH CASE THE OFFICIAL DATE OF RECEIPT WILL BE THE NEXT BUSINESS DAY.

THE DOCUMENT(S) ACCOMPANYING THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION CONTAIN(S) INFORMATION FROM THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE WHICH IS CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. THIS INFORMATION IS FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR FIRM NAMED ON THIS SHEET. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISCLOSURE, COPYING, DISTRIBUTION, OR THE TAKING OF ANY ACTION IN RELIANCE ON THE CONTENTS OF THIS INFORMATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THE DOCUMENTS SHOULD BE RETURNED TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IMMEDIATELY. IF THIS FACSIMILE IS RECEIVED IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY THE ATTORNEY LISTED HEREON IMMEDIATELY.